

# the bullet

Mary Washington College

vol. 44, no. 10

p.o. box 1115, Fredericksburg, Virginia

Thursday, November 18, 1971

## Faculty members respond to Honor criticism

Responding to the recent controversy centering around the existence of an Honor System here, several professors have stated that they support the Honor System, at least in its academic function, and would like to see it remain as an institution at the college. Others criticize the system and see it as hypocritical.

However, most of the professors interviewed thought there should be a clarification of the social aspect of the Honor System or that the social function should be abandoned altogether. All agreed that a situation of mutual trust presently existed in the classroom and a few faculty felt that mutual student-professor trust would be retained even without an Honor System to monitor that trust.

Physics professor Nicoli Nicolice called the Honor System a "question of formality." He emphasized that "it is the act that makes it immoral" and that a morally binding legal system would exist in the classroom with or without a formal system of enforcement. The Honor System was not capable of preventing the cheaters from cheating, Nicolice said, but "might deter some borderline" students who were hesitant about cheating or plagiarizing.

Nicolice added that someone needs to "try to clarify the social aspect" of the Honor System and he added that "you cannot legislate morality" with an academic and social system of honor.

Lewis P. Fickett of the Political Science Department said that he had taught in schools which did not have an honor system and found that a "happier feeling" existed in the academic community where an honor system did exist.

Fickett maintained that a system of academic honor was better when it was "self-imposed," rather than handed down from above and felt there was a need for "self-appointed rules."

"I think it's still a useful system as far as realizing the academic aspect of the community," Fickett said in reference to a student proposal to eliminate the Honor System. "You live with a system and you get to like it," Fickett concluded.

English department chairman Donald P. Glover said something would have to be done "if students were not bound by the (Honor) System." Adding, that he "would be very unhappy" if a mutual trust between student and professor failed to exist, he emphasized, "I would hate to see it go."

History professor Roger Bourdon said he also "would like to see it (the Honor System) survive on campus." "Quite frankly, it's the best system I've seen anywhere I've taught," he said.

Bourdon commented that life in a campus community was dependent upon such a system and that survival in that community was related to a mutual trust.

Honor Council advisor and art instructor Cornelia Oliver said the proposals initiated by student Jack Flynn to eradicate the Honor System were "going through the minds of everybody on the Honor Council."

She felt the "anachronistic aspects of it (the Honor System) should be carefully re-examined" and underscored the Honor System for its social role, saying, "I don't think it works socially . . . and I don't think it should be expected to."

Oliver said there was "something sacrosanct about the Honor System" at Mary Washington College. It could not be as sacrosanct as it appears, she noted, because "some schools have gotten along beautifully without it."

Oliver called the Honor Code "a protector for the honest student" but did not see it as "a deterrent for the dishonest student."

Criticizing Flynn for his comment about faculty fear of stating opinion because of fear for jobs, she maintained that she would "hate to think there are too many people here" who are afraid to make statements of opinion. However, she felt that Flynn "has put into words" the opinions and scepticisms of many at MWC have with regard to the Honor System.

Geography department chairman Samuel T. Emory maintained that he agreed "completely with the Honor System." He added, "If you don't have the Honor System you have some other type of system which means people like me playing policeman."

Emory commented that he had taught under other systems and found it "very, very unpleasant." He cautioned students to consider the full consequences of their actions to dissolve the Honor System at MWC.

English professor Sidney P. Mitchell said the Honor System should be "totally restricted to academic matters," and that social matters should be excluded.

In response to an Honor Council opinion poll, he told Honor Council President Beth Conrad earlier this year. "I truly believe that the strength of the system lies in largest part from its positive rather than its punitive features and that the less it is an imposed thing the better."

## Merchants prosecute shoplifting women

(AFS) A four-state retail investigative agency recently computer-studied shoplifting patterns based on some 13,000 apprehensions in supermarkets and 7,000 drugstores in California last year, mostly in shopping centers. Supermarkets prosecuted 29 per cent of the suspects; drugstores 34 per cent (even though thefts only average four or five dollars.) The relative leniency of supermarkets may be because mostly food was stolen, as opposed to luxury items in drugstores; and market managers are more likely to come from the poor class than are druggists. But even so, prosecutions by supermarkets have risen seven per cent in eight years.

Drugstore thefts occurred usually in November and December (23 per cent), fewest in January (five per cent). Peak supermarket theft months were February through April (27 per cent)—when people are paying for the stuff they didn't steal before Christmas. But the report noted, "Supermarkets can anticipate an even distribution of shoplifting year round."

Half of the drugstore thefts occurred Friday through Sunday (much of it by adolescents); in supermarkets, from Wednesday through Friday (before payday). The fewest busts in supermarkets were on Sunday (less than ten per cent) because of thinned working staffs. Everywhere, peak hours were from noon to nine p.m.; especially 3-6 p.m.

Involvement was distributed about equally between men and women; favored hiding places were pockets, bags, strollers or underclothing (especially in markets). About 25 per cent of the suspects were 18-30 years old; less than 29 per cent were over 30 (only about 16 per cent of the women were "menopausal," a defense often used).

Except in supermarkets, women were more likely than men to be prosecuted, even as juveniles.

A merchants' anti-shoplifting seminar, sponsored by New York State, revealed two things that store owners most fear in busting boosters: the possibility of a false-arrest suit, and time spent in court. Legal advisors told the merchants that clerks can detain a shopper if they reasonably suspect he stole something; but they do best to wait until the police arrive to effect a search. The merchant can avoid a court case, the State spokesman said: "Get a written confession from the shoplifter the first time he is caught, then tell him the next time he is caught he'll be prosecuted" for one or both crimes. The store owners were assured that only about five to ten per cent of the suspects ever plead innocent, and those that do rarely ask for the jury trial to which they are entitled.

## Senate passes tax rebate for parents

A proposal to give parents a \$325 annual tax rebate on the cost of sending a child to college, was approved in the senate by a vote of 56 to 27, Monday.

The proposal, sponsored by Ernest F. Hollings (D-S.C.) and Abraham A. Ribicoff (D-Conn.), was tacked onto the President's multi-billion-dollar tax cut bill, after several days of debate in the Senate.

The Senate also approved, by a 59 to 24 vote, an amendment by Sen. John V. Tunney (D-Calif.) allowing working couples to deduct up to \$4,800 a year for child-care expenses. Under the Tunney child-care provision, a couple would be eligible for the full \$4,800 child-care deduction only if they earned a combined income of \$18,000 a year or less. But they could still receive some deductions if their combined income was as high as \$27,600, since a phase-out feature reduces the maximum deduction by \$1 for each \$2 earned above \$18,000. This raised the income cut-off of \$12,000, recommended by the Finance Committee, by one-third.

According to estimations by the committee, approximately 1.4 million persons would be eligible for various child-care deductions under the bill, including Tunney's amendment. The existing law limits the deduction to \$600 and only couples with a combined annual income of \$6,000 or less are eligible for it. If approved in conference with the House, the child-care deductions are expected to free hundreds of thousands of women for work outside the home by making it financially easier to hire household help.

The Hollings-Ribicoff amendment on college deductions will be applicable to each child. It provides for a tax rebate or credit on outlays for tuition, books and equipment, at the rate of 75 per cent of the first \$200 spent, 25 per cent of the next \$300, and 10 per cent of the next \$1,000. This works out to a maximum of \$325 on the first \$1,500 a year spent for college. Families with no income tax liability would receive a direct repayment from the Treasury. Hollings said his provision would cost the Treasury \$2 billion a year in lost taxes.

The Senate has passed similar provisions twice before, only to have them killed in conference with the House.

## BULLET elections next month

The following positions on the BULLET staff are now open for next semester:

Editor-in-chief  
assistant editor  
exchange editor  
layout editor

Send letters of application to ACL Room 104 by December 1. Results will be announced December 6, 1971.

## Obligation to conscience

by Beth Conrad

### editorial

## Dragging Dylan in

In an absurd rush for now-fashionable relevancy, many universities have recently instituted majors in Peace.

Many students, eager to make something meaningful out of four often frustrating years of college, have taken issue with the nature of academia. They argue that what we learn in college is not what we need to know in order to live as fulfilled human beings... that education, as it exists, is not relevant. Such an argument may be justified. It is, nevertheless, pointless.

It is not the job of an educational institution to provide timely and relevant studies. If a student believes in structured learning, then it becomes their job to investigate many areas and pull from each, what they feel is worthwhile and applicable to their lives. Educators and students share the burden of teaching and learning the methods of learning.

It is absurd to drag Bob Dylan, the Beatles, Tom Wolfe, Ken Kesey, the Vietnam War, and peace into a classroom structured with grades, papers and exams, and fool yourself into believing that that is what relevancy is about. The very structure itself defeats the purpose.

The "new culture" may well be worth studying, but not in a structured educational institution. A peace major is just the latest example. Peace, like relevancy, is something you earn individually by living and striving, not something you learn collectively by studying.

L.C.

## the bullet

robin darling	editor
linda cayton	assistant
linda kay carpenter	business
liz dodge	news
bethany woodward	news
diane smith	features
becky rasmussen	photography
phile funk	exchange
paddy link	arts
rita bissell	advertising
liz pully	circulation

The opinions expressed herein are not necessarily those of the College or the student body, nor are opinions expressed in signed articles and columns necessarily those of the editor or all members of the editorial board.

Signed letters to the editor are invited from all readers. The BULLET will print all letters within the limits of space and subject to the laws of libel. Letters should be brought to the BULLET office no later than Thursday before the Monday of publication. The BULLET reserves the right to edit all contributions for grammatical and technical errors. Subscriptions are \$4.00 per year. Write The BULLET, Box 1115, College Station, Fredericksburg, Va. 22401.

I, Beth Conrad, support and will support the Honor System at Mary Washington College.

In light of the discussion during this past week stemming from an article on the future of the Honor System published in the November 8 BULLET, I would like to state my position on the status, value and future of the Honor System at Mary Washington. I feel that an Honor System is wanted and enjoyed by the majority of the students on this campus but I have an obligation to my conscience as well as to my constituents to continue to provide the most equitable and viable system possible. It is essential for a clear understanding of this statement that I present to you my concept of the office of Honor Council President. I feel that it is an obligation of the Honor Council President to ascertain student opinion concerning the Honor System and moreover to encourage that all opinions be aired. This is not my honor system, it is ours—it belongs to us. The System we will live under is the System accepted and desired by the majority. But we must objectively evaluate all alternative proposals.

Last year, I sent out a questionnaire to each student on this campus, asking for student opinion about the Honor System. In response I received only 565 completed questionnaires out of approximately 2200 students polled. This year I sent a letter to each Department Chairman as well as to each faculty member, asking for their personal and professional opinion of the Honor System. At this point I have received responses from seven out of the twenty-two Department Chairmen and twelve out of the one hundred and eighty faculty members. I believe in recognizing the opinions of all. I have attempted to ascertain them. If students are dissatisfied with parts of our System, then I will be open and I demand their opinions. If students are pleased, then I feel that in the interest of all and especially for the System's success that they must let their feelings be known.

Jack Flynn questions our System and I feel that he has the right to be heard. He has brought up interesting points. I disagree with his hope to abolish our System. I feel that the System is wanted and needed on this campus to ensure a standard of trust and to provide academic freedoms. We need a structure. The question of structure is one which the Council continually discusses each year. Since we have relinquished a system which provided only for absolute dismissal in cases of guilt, the Council has had to re-examine its function as well as its structure every year. If we had retained the old system, then the Council would not have to reevaluate itself. Proposals are made every year in attempts to seek perfection. We must be willing to evaluate our System and any alternatives which students wish to present. I cannot be satisfied with any imperfections in our System and although, I realize that this may not be practical, I will continue to seek perfection and to try to provide the best System for this campus.

I have expressed a desire to see the Honor System put to a vote. I am hoping that we will get a campus-wide vote of confidence for the System. My election certainly was not a mandate for some specific type of activity of innovation—it was merely an affirmation of the need to preserve a system of honor. Less than nine hundred students voted—what do the other students think? A majority opinion must be expressed in a vote on the System itself.

In view of the Council's continuing self-study, I feel that a provision should be

included in our present Constitution allowing for an evaluation committee to be appointed every three to five years to discuss those years and to suggest proposals and new methods of approach to all the aspects of the System. Council members now do this every year. This should not be necessary. The present system should be allowed to have some time to work. I feel that the Council should not take the sole responsibility for proposing changes for the Constitution. This student committee, including some members of the Honor Council, should be responsible for considering the general student opinions as well as the Council's opinions on revisions.

We must also decide what we expect from our faculty in regards to the Honor System. More and more professors are handling cases themselves. Maybe this re-inforces the individualness of our System or maybe it is weakening the System in that the professor is not entrusting the Honor Council with the decision. As always there are two sides on these evaluative questions. Personally, I feel that the Honor System in the academics is effective. It is seeking the perfection for which we are all here. I feel that we should try to unify the faculty in their feelings for our System.

Mr. Flynn has suggested the implementation of a faculty grievance board. I do not feel this would be acceptable. The faculty do not live under the Code in its entirety as the student does and therefore should not be called upon to judge. The positions of Honor Council Faculty Advisors are included in our Constitution to provide for faculty advice when it is needed by the Council.

There is another point of clarification necessary regarding Mr. Flynn's interpretation of the statement that Council members would bend over backwards to try to get a girl out of trouble. During trials, the President and the Council try to their utmost to provide a fair trial before making a decision. We do not try to get the accused out of trouble simply because she is the accused. We are as fair as we can be. And this is justice.

The social aspects of the Honor System—specifically stealing and those social cases involving lying—need re-examination. Again we must seek perfection. We must stop the stealing in the dorms, even to the extent of not tolerating the stealing of food from the refrigerators. Sure, some may say it's human nature and bound to happen but we must not use that as an excuse. You must decide! If you are not going to enforce rules, then they must be re-examined. We must continually try to right the wrongs. If you want the social aspects of the Honor System kept, then do not tolerate the stealing. As I quoted last week, "I don't want a farce around here." So make it work.

I regret that last week's editorial did not state the facts as they are. This year's counseling was geared specifically toward an understanding and knowledge of the System and not toward fear tactics. Only through complete understanding can our System work. The point of unlocked doors and unwatched money brings up the point of carelessness. We are trying to provide the best System possible for outright carelessness in another area which cannot be tolerated. The chances of punishment are not slight. We provide a fair trial and in cases of guilt the Council decides in the interest of the entire community, the people involved, and the System itself.

Is it meaningless? No, neither is it useless, ludicrous or worn out.

# feedback: honor system

editorial

## Gut reaction

To the Editor:

"Student reaction," perhaps the most nebulous, over-used and irrelevant phrase in our vocabulary, is to be given specific definition by signing an open letter to Beth Conrad: Honor Council President requires objectivity as the strongest value in the position. As students, under the existing code, we resent the quoted commentary by Beth Conrad in the last BULLET issue. Regardless of the reasons behind her statement, it is an appalling lack of responsibility to comment publicly on an issue that has not yet been presented to the student body. To take issue with possible abolishment or limitation of the Honor Code, while representing the system at its most strategic level, undermines her very position and the system itself.

We also take issue with Beth's statements: "There's no honor and security in the system the way it is now." There is none when confidence cannot be manifested at the highest echelon. Be specific Beth, where is there no "safety and security"?

"I think the whole system needs to be voted on every few years. The one we have now is 72 years old. . . something drastically needs to be done." The lack of logic behind that statement is ludicrous. Such rationale does need "eratic" attention.

"But I think we should have it (the Honor Code) academically, with a Grievances Committee to handle that part of it. I am in favor of doing away with the social part of it. The Security Department of the Administration should handle it." Divide the system and you receive a token attempt of legislative personal ethics. We have chosen to live under a self-regulatory system; we must continue the process—give "it" to the Security Department? Not on your life, Beth.

It is startling to consider that a generation preaching trust, love, and peace has digressed so far; perhaps it was never true. But, we trust . . . we have the personal integrity to support a system as an ideal and to strive for that very ideal. The reality is harsh, people do steal and cheat. But if we adjust our ideals to the reality—consider the atmosphere we create; we destroy the dichotomy by which we can achieve.

P.S. "The Honor System, under question for several years, may be abolished next semester."

This kind of journalistic immaturity is as disavowable as Beth's statements. It is a crass example of overstatement. Your loophole is "may be." It's the easy way out of writing a good article, Robin. Half the facts are not better than none. You desperately need specifics.

The preceding has been a statement of conscience.

Bobbe Pilik  
Joy Praet  
Debi Gill  
Laurel Praet  
Mary McFadyen  
Stephanie Sweeney  
Judy Robinson  
Betsy Smith

To the Editor:

I would just like to comment on the proposal to abolish the Honor System. I agree with Jack Flynn that some parts of our Honor Code are outdated but it is senseless to abolish the whole thing.

First of all, a day student may see the social aspect of the code as being useless, but any resident student can see the definite need for some sort of honor system among themselves and within the dorms. We need some type of system where the students can handle their own social honor problems without turning it over to the Security Department.

Secondly, referring to honor in the classroom, Flynn states that "students aren't qualified to handle questions of this sort." If we're not qualified now, when will we be qualified? We are the ones involved, why shouldn't we be the ones to "handle the question?"

Again, I agree that the Honor Code needs revising, but to abolish it would be destroying an integral part of the college.

Candy Beaman

To the Editor:

Contrary to the recent BULLET editorial of November 7, I do not agree that the Honor System on this campus is "meaningless or worn out." I also am of the conviction that the majority of students here agree with me.

Certainly the argument can be made that violations occur, but this fact does not make the system ludicrous. In a community of twenty-two hundred individuals it is not surprising that incidents of stealing or cheating take place. What is important is the relatively few instances that do occur and the overall feeling of academic and social freedom which does exist as an active force on this campus. This phenomenon not only proves that students consider an honorable standard of behavior meaningful, but that they are committed to making it work.

Recently much controversy has been raised over retaining the Honor System in the social realm. At a dorm contact meeting held last Tuesday night, the only widespread thefts reported were made out of iceboxes and the only thefts of major consequence were reported from one dorm. Certainly these instances are not to be condoned, but it is important to note that this years stealing is no more serious than has been recorded in past years. Granted more doors have needed to be locked and more precautions taken to keep the stealing in check, but this years record still proves that the system is not falling apart socially.

As far as the academic realm is concerned, there is no doubt that students value a working Honor Code. The positive aspects of the system have often been enumerated (unproctored, tests, self-scheduled exams, take-home tests. . .

Jack Flynn's proposal, like the Honor System, labels cheating and plagiarism as unacceptable. But would his proposed method of dealing with violations be more effective than our present code? Would a two sentence statement on conduct followed by a list of possible punishments be any different from having an Honor Code? Would a system regulated and enforced by a faculty grievance committee be preferable to one upheld by peers? Is a system set down and enforced by one segment of the community more effective than one agreed upon and enforced by all? Obviously my answer to these questions is NO. The system Mr. Flynn proposes in replacement of the Honor System would not be an effective method of dealing with dishonesty in academic matters. It reduces cheating to a game between faculty and students rather than a code of behavior between all members of the community.

Besides expressing my reasons for upholding the Honor Code, I feel that a word of explanation needs to be made regarding Mr. Flynn's statement that the council "bends over backwards to get a girl out of trouble." I can only speak for myself in this letter, but I feel that other members of Council agree, that the statement was misinterpreted. The Council "bends over backwards" to give students a fair trial and to consider all evidence. If that is not justice, what is?

In conclusion, the Honor Code here is so different from the one at the University of Virginia that the two should no longer be compared. The code at Mary Washington College has nothing to do with maintaining an eighteenth century conception of gentlemanly honor. Mary Washington is not trying to make students honest, it is attempting to maintain and enforce a standard of living which creates an atmosphere of academic and social freedom.

Think about your attitudes toward the system. Do you live in constant fear or has it become so much a part of your life here that you rarely even think about it? Think about the benefits of the system. Are you ready to give them up? The Honor Code has been a way of life on this campus for many years. In this day of widespread social and political reform, people tend to look on any established institution as "Out-of-date" and "in need of change." But do not some institutions embody values that are worthy of being retained regardless of changes made around them? Recently our campus has been swept into the current of new ideas. As a result many changes have been made in our curriculum and living conditions. But let us not sweep our Honor System away with Saturday classes and beanies. We have inherited an admirable and workable Honor System from our predecessors at Mary Washington. We have experienced many freedoms under it. Let us leave it for future classes to enjoy. Is it right for us to deny them the social and academic freedom we enjoy today?

Kathy Bradford  
Senior Honor Representative

All institutions change; if they do not do it willingly, from within, they are subjected to it forcefully. Either way, and official resistance notwithstanding, outmoded rules are either forced out of use or fall into disrepair. In colleges, curfews have given way to open house, as a rule, and course requirements have tended to be relaxed as part of the normal course of change.

Here, as at other schools, students have been the prime movers in persuading or forcing administrators to change the rules. The scope of the recent revision of all the regulations here—social and academic—is startling. In two years, entirely new options for study have replaced the mandatory program which once filled almost the first half of a student's education. And residential students, required to state the details of any overnight absence, are now free to leave with whom they choose and come back at any hour they choose, without accounting for themselves.

Students were the ones who agitated for the removal of what had been strict rules. It is surprising now that the general reaction is so strongly against another suggestion for change.

Last week we supported Jack Flynn's proposal for abolishing the Honor System. We believe his criticism is accurate; when the president of the Honor Council can level the same sort of critical appraisal at the system, it is obvious that a student-wide reexamination should result.

Instead, numbers of students have launched personal attacks on those who have suggested that there may be something wrong with the system as it is presently malfunctioning. It is a gut reaction, and while it has obscured the meaning of the proposals for change, it shows the extent to which silly fear can produce outbursts of ill-thought-out diatribe.

We suggest that students turn their energy toward thinking through the proposal and the arguments against it. When and if the system comes up for a referendum we may then be able to vote cool headedly instead of compulsively.





# Welsh calls Honor System reevaluation necessary

**BULLET**—How do you feel towards Jack Flynn's idea of changing the Honor System as it now stands?

**WELSH**—Well, I think I tend to agree with Jack Flynn merely because I think that some kind of study or reevaluation of the Honor System is essential at this point. I think that what we tend to say is that a breaking down of the Honor System is perhaps a lack of consideration of the values and the basic fundamental beliefs that would constitute an Honor System, and a lot of people would want one, whether or not it truly is a provider of academic freedoms, or whether or not it really gives us a kind of security, or whether it is merely some kind of police force. I think that's something that everyone has to decide for themselves and that Jack is questioning whether or not people have made that kind of decision or it's something that they just blindly believe in. In the kind of changes he's proposing I think that basically he's proposing to have become a much stricter system. From what conversation I've had and what I've gathered from his article he does not think that the changes in punishments that came out three years ago has necessarily benefited the system. I think he feels the Honor System, if we have one should be much more of an absolute. Whether or not this is good, I'm really not sure. I think certainly as a personal thing it's generally absolute when one is trying to judge honor in another. I think the problems are much more complex and therefore perhaps an absolute system would be ineffective; perhaps its inflexibility would punish people for things that perhaps there was a lack of control, they had a lack of control over and perhaps just in the sense of appearing a rigid system would not be that effective.

**BULLET**—Why did you say that Flynn's proposal is more strict?

**WELSH**—Well, it seems to me that he's saying that it must become one blanket thing, plagiarism and cheating are just not accepted and that the consequences would be strict; it would be, from what he said about the faculty grievance committee, something just between the faculty member and the student and the faculty member would decide, and you wouldn't be given the benefit of the doubt that you're given in a trial situation where all sorts of evidence are allowed to be uncovered, conversation is entailed which would demonstrate psychological and emotional stress, you know, any kind of basic problem a student would undergo. I think perhaps it would be certainly a much more just system, and that perhaps the absolutism that he is suggesting is possibly detrimental to a student involved in an academic situation.

**BULLET**—Do you agree or disagree with Beth Conrad's statement that there is no safety or security in the present system?

**WELSH**—I think the first thing that has to be noted is that when you're in a position like Honor Council president, it sometimes is very restricting to personalities. Often you have responsibilities to yourself and to your conscience that sometimes appear from the outside to be restricted by your position and its a decision that each person involved in that situation, each Honor Council President, would have to make whether or not she must speak as herself first and as a member of the Council second, or that whenever she speaks she merely represents the Council. I think that what Beth is trying to do is show that through her intense involvement with the Honor system she has questions, it's obvious, at least from my knowledge of Beth, that she doesn't question the Honor System at all, that she believes in it and she thinks that some system of Honor is extremely necessary, but I think that through three years of intense involvement one begins to question all facets of it. I think sometimes it appears when one's studying and re-studying a constitution and trying to make it the most perfect document, often one wonders if the entire document is necessary and whether or not it's actually not much more of a restriction. When you're trying to enforce anything, and you got involved with personalities, conflicts and emotional stress and just carelessness and anything else, trying to make decisions on what is going to help all in all cases is extremely difficult. And I must say that when you get constant telephone calls about one petty violation after another, most of which cannot be handled because of lack of information concerned, it would be fairly easy to believe that socially the Honor System is not only not effective but very hard to enforce. I think there's something that each student would have to realize for herself

is that if Beth is going to be able to enforce it, they have to enforce it and that it's a matter of Beth not being able to do anything about wanton carelessness. She can do something if people are all actively supporting it but if they won't or can't then obviously that puts her in an untenable position, and I think that those are things that even, not necessarily other members of the Honor Council are necessarily privy to those kinds of feelings and that Beth is at this point trying to demonstrate the complexity of both her job and the complexity of the system and the problems that have led her to believe that a reevaluation is necessary. Unfortunately, not all people believe that you are able to speak as yourself and speak in reference to your conscience, and that I feel that, and I know that Beth feels that this is something that is necessary.

**BULLET**—How do you feel yourself about the Honor System as a whole, its effectiveness etc.?

**WELSH**—How does one start this? Well, first of all, I don't believe that signing a pledge card in the beginning of your freshman year is necessarily a statement that one is a honorable person, and this is basically the point of the card, to say that not only are you honorable but that you are willing to uphold a system of honor. I feel that if a lot of people the fact that this is signed under duress, if only because if you don't sign it you cannot come here, therefore, it is restricting entrance to the institution, that this is unfair, and that I personally do not feel that this should be a prerequisite for attendance at Mary Washington.

Another question that I have about the Honor System is whether in fact eight or nine girls are actually capable of judging all aspects of any kind of violation of the Honor System, and whether or not they have the ability and/or the right to make a decision, especially involving the social infraction of the Honor System, whether or not a student should be allowed to continue her academic career at Mary Washington. It's not a matter of not believing in judgment by one's peers as much as it is a matter of wondering whether these are violations which can be justly decided and whether or not one for a social infraction should be dismissed from an academic institution.

As I understand the Honor System, one should feel obligated to report or feel necessary to enforce the Honor System, which would mean to me that if I saw a student stealing, or if I saw a student cheating on an exam, then I should feel obligated to turn them in. Maybe this is personal, or maybe this is a more widespread opinion, but I do not feel that unless the situation was so grievous that my personal well-being was at stake, could I or would I turn another student in. I realize that this is detrimental to the success of the Honor System because one of the basic tenants is that all people who believe in it also feel obligated to support it in such a fashion. If we're going to have an Honor System that is effective, I realize that I must be careful with my possessions, that I must not encourage other people to steal, I can't leave money around, if I had any to leave around, and that not only can I not cheat because of personal conscience as well as the system, if I see someone cheat I must turn them in. Now I find this something extremely difficult to do. I think that if a lot of people think that this is difficult and moreover would not do it, then a serious reevaluation of the system is necessary. Perhaps there is some way to have an Honor System where it is just a matter of personal honor, that everyone makes a basic commitment to the college that they are honorable and that they feel that the proctoring of examinations is not necessary for them and that the system would go on, to me in any case, pretty much the same it does not.

Another detriment to the success of the system seems to me to be the lack of uniformity within the attitude of various members of the faculty to the system. It seems to me that if one has an extremely understanding professor or one who has close contact with the students and is aware of certain stresses perhaps an offense towards the system, perhaps some kind of plagiarism or something on a test may be dealt purely with on a faculty member-student basis, and perhaps a student may flunk a course or she may write the paper over. But in any case, this seems to me to be unfair to a student who has an extremely strict professor and would give her no benefit of the doubt and who would immediately bring her up for trial in front of the council. It could be said that each student is receiving what is necessary for that student and yet it

doesn't seem to me necessarily fair to the system unless there is some kind of uniformity involved.

Also, I don't believe that one's support of the honor system should merely be something that is based on a level of sentimentality. If someone is going to have a strong belief in an honor system and if an honor system is going to work, one's support must be on a totally rational level. Just because the honor system has been a tradition here for 27 years is not necessarily something to its credit. What is to its credit is the fact that it has been constantly reevaluated and that many attempts have been made to make it as relevant and flexible to the needs of students as it possibly can be. My question is at this point is have we gone too far with this present system and have all the attempts to make it a more relevant and more flexible system merely made it an unenforceable system and one in which belief is extremely difficult? Perhaps we're at the point now where we have to either go back to an absolute system of honor where one is dismissed or not dismissed as the case may be, or that we have to totally forget the kind of system we have now and go back to something, perhaps that which Mr. Flynn has suggested or perhaps just a system of individual honor.

Beth is quoted in last week's BULLET as having stated that "there is no safety and security in the system the way it is now." I must say that I disagree with Beth. I can't say that I've really found safety and security within the system, but I can say that I have been able to find safety and security in my belief that everyone is intrinsically honorable. What this statement then brings into my mind is the fact that maybe the system is not necessary, that everyone can find safety and security in the belief in their own honesty and in an intrinsic belief in others. If one doesn't share that kind of feeling perhaps would not want to be associated with the community of this variety. But I would have to agree with Beth in that for many people there is no safety or security in the system now and these are the people who have been generally affected by social infractions. Certainly to me there can't be any safety if in a dorm I can't keep my door open. But I don't feel that because stealing goes on that I should have to lock my door. It seems to me that it's not my locking my door that should be prohibiting someone from stealing, it's some kind of community pressure and belief in honor and in a greater good that one does not steal. It seems to me that this is what is going to make an honor system work and realistic and one that is worth believing in. There is a community spirit that one does not steal, cheat or plagiarize or offend an honor system in any other way. Then it is going to work.

It seems to me that in the discussion that followed both last week's BULLET as well as the general consideration of the honor system, there's a movement among many people to try and stifle any kind of questioning of the system. It seems to me that in trying to stifle discussion or smother dissent or whatever you want to call this kind of action, that a greater harm is being done to the honor system than any kind of questioning. People who care enough to question are probably the most valuable members of this community, for at least they are the ones that are aware that such a system exists, they are aware that it is having an impact or is not having an impact on their lives, and they are aware that perhaps changes must be made through time and most importantly, one must have an active concern for a system that is affecting their lives because without that active concern they are hurting both themselves and the system that is being imposed upon them.

Another thing about Beth's position is that one always has to remember that as well as just being Beth Conrad, Honor Council President, but also Beth Conrad, student, and you may say that she is giving up one role for another, in reality, that isn't so. One must allow every student on this campus the right to make any kind of remark as to the effect of various systems or programs or beliefs upon their lives. It doesn't necessarily mean that it should be abused or used flagrantly or whatever, but the fact that people aren't willing to accept that kind of people from a person in a higher office on this campus is probably the most harmful attitudes present on this campus.

The last thing that I would like to say is that to know Beth Conrad is to know that she's not a farce.

# Liberation charlatans

by Philo Funk

A spectre is haunting the American public—the specter of human rights. No Liberated Collegian or Concerned Citizen worth his class will resist feeling righteous indignation over society's mistreatment of its mothers, Blacks, gays, fannies, paralytics, or impoverished. Academia in particular pounces on any scheme with this sanctimonious claim, for it is within whose ivy walls the enlightened, the "liberated" reside.

So today American campuses are crawling with men, women, Gay, and Fat (Bard College initiated this one) Liberation bugs. Their sensitive antenna will pick up the slightest ripple of injustice perpetrated on the most downtrodden of society's dregs. The problems and the injustices are credible enough. The spirit that inspires the Liberators is good and probably untainted. The early Civil Rights movement was in fact, a model of decency and humanity. Resurrection City was comprehensible to the Black people. They built it and lived in it; it's goal was their goal and they understood this.

But the human rights crusaders of this more recent vintage are charlatans joy-riding on the waves of those first civil righters. We speak in rhetoric, in clichés with glamor. We scream human rights, that Black is Beautiful, that Sisterhood is Powerful, but an inherent bias of class-consciousness separates the leaders from the followers and contaminates the movement. Kate Millet is armed with college degrees, social status, and a white skin as she tells the American public what the values of a Welfare mother of ten. Sister Millet will speak about fulfillment, freedom, and self-determination. But for Kate Millet

freedom is a free 24 hour day care center and a free abortion on demand, while for the welfare mother it may simply be the freedom to be a mother—to feed her children because they're hungry and to be with them because they're hers.

Secularity for the white and educated woman's libber is termed meaningful, self-discovering, explorative, while her black and uneducated "sister" is "decadent," "immoral," and "promiscuous" for the same behavior. Her welfare checks are cut down if she keeps a man in her house; while for her white, more advantaged "sister" the same type of premartial living arrangement is "liberating," "free," and "meaningful." The welfare mother is charged with desertion if she goes to a motel for the night—but her "sister" can afford a babysitter and isn't going to get checked on anyway. Sister Millet condemns male dominance in the physical act of sexual intercourse; the welfare mother is denied the human right to have intercourse.

Marx taught that the grass roots working class population should be the core of any revolutionary movement. Instead Millet's campaign seems to have an overabundance of high-faluting females buzzing around on their own ego-trips. Their sexual fantasies and/or aberrations have little relevance for the most oppressed members of their sex.

Jerry Rubin said this week that he would like his followers to recapture the "innocence" and the "naivete" of the first civil emancipators. Today's charlatans have to liberate themselves first—and break through the confines of their own class-consciousness.

## Lennon's new album diverse, spotty

by Bethany Woodward

"imagine there's no heaven  
it's easy if you try  
no hell below us  
above us only sky  
imagine all the people  
living for today . . .

you may say i'm a dreamer  
but i'm not the only one  
i hope someday you'll join us  
and the world will be as one"

"imagine" John Lennon's new album, begins with this childlike vision. It's perhaps the nicest song I've heard Lennon do in a long time. The piano is played in a soft, flowing lullaby manner and Lennon's voice is clear and unstrained, almost pristine. The orchestration backing up the piece, played by The Flux Fiddlers, is extremely good and lends to the overall innocence of the song.

"crippled inside" snaps you out of the dream-like state of "imagine" with George Harrison's tight bass, Lennon's player piano sound, and a miscellaneous washboard or two. The song has a real down-home beat with a straight forward message, something Lennon doesn't always give.

"it's so hard" is a mean, throbbing song. King Curtis is featured on sax along with Lennon at his best guitar playing. Although the song is pure honky-tonk, Lennon manages to relay an essentially good message, which saves the song from sounding like a come on for aspiring Gypsy Rose Lees.

"i don't wanna be a soldier mama i don't wanna die", starts off sounding similar to the introduction of Jefferson Airplane's "She has Funny Cars." But it breaks off into a weird conglomeration of electronic

sounds. All the instruments in the song are off on their own trip, only occasionally merging on some distinctive note. King Curtis' sax does break through all the electronics at certain points, but always wails off before giving you anything concrete. The song could be extremely disturbing if you weren't in the right frame of mind—and Lennon really plays this up.

"gimme some truth" is an example of Lennon at his worst. It's full of radical chic phrases which makes the song extremely boring. The only good thing about it is Harrison's guitar solo.

Lennon comes back rather nicely with "oh my love". It's basically a love song with the mellow sound of "imagine". Nicky Hopkins carries the song with a beautiful piano solo and Lennon once again keys his voice down to the smooth quality found in "imagine".

"how?" asks all the questions everyone must ask about themselves at one time. The song has more of the great orchestration back-up found in "imagine", which keeps "how?" from sounding like a consciousness-raising session.

"oh yoko" is an atracity. The only good thing it has going for it is Hopkins' piano and Lennon's harmonica which happens to sound uncomfortably similar to a Dylan tune I've heard.

All in all, Lennon's album is good, but not outstandingly so.

"in the middle of a shave  
in the middle of a shave i call your name  
oh yoko, oh yoko, my love will turn you on"

## Tech students drop rules

Three Virginia Polytechnic Institute dormitories, representing 1500 students, voted last week to ignore administrative social rules and create their own regulations.

Statements issued by the dormitories urge students to use their individual discretion in conforming or violating the administration's social rules, until the governing bodies of the dorms officially rewrite residence hall policy.

Current social regulations allow visitors of the opposite sex to visit in the dorms for only a few hours each weekend and requires that room doors be left open at least six inches. The administration also requires registration of all guests.

These administrative regulations, when formulated last fall, sparked six days of demonstrations, petitioning, marching, a few incidents of window-breaking, and the burning of an office building.

The dormitory students who have endorsed violation of the social rules, have organized the Virginia Tech Coalition, which was formed as Terry Adams, president of men's dormitory council stated, not at the whim of an elite minority group, rather it was born in the dorms and is growing from the demands of the students in the dorms.

Adams explained that the purpose of the coalition was "to educate the students of their rights as guaranteed by state and federal law . . . serve to inform the students of actions taking place in the various dorms by students and the administration . . . and exist as a working force of students through the only legitimate democratic means offered by the university."

The president of the VPI student government association, the editor of the school newspaper, and the general manager of the campus radio station have all endorsed the massive violations of social regulations, explaining that, "It's time the State got out of the business of regulating the morals of its citizens."

## Va. events

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 19

Hampton Institute:

Jean-Leon Destine and his Afro-Haitian Dance Company; Ogden Hall, \$2.50, 8:15 p.m.

Virginia Military Institute:

FILM—"Sympathy for the Devil"; 8:00 p.m.

University of Virginia:

CONCERT—U.Va. Jazz Ensemble; Old Cabell Hall, 8:30 p.m.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 21

Hampton Roads Coliseum:

CONCERT—Ike and Tina Turner

CONCERT—Guess Who; \$5.00, \$4.00, \$3.00, 8:00 p.m.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 22

University of Virginia:

CONCERT—The Budapest Symphony Orchestra; University Hall, \$5.00, 8:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 24

Hampton Roads Coliseum:

CONCERT—The James Gang

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 25

Norfolk:

CONCERT—Dionne Warwick; Convention Hall, \$6.00, \$5.00, \$4.00, 8:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 26

Hampton Roads Coliseum:

CONCERT—Smokey Robinson and the Miracles

Richmond Coliseum:

CONCERT—Dionne Warwick; \$6.50, \$5.50, \$4.50, 8:00 p.m.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 27

Roanoke Coliseum:

CONCERT—Smokey Robinson and the Miracles; Coliseum, 8:30 p.m.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 28

Norfolk:

CONCERT—Isaac Hayes; Convention Hall, \$7.00, \$6.00, \$5.00, 8:00 p.m.

## Omission

Kathi Sullivan, '72, has been elected to Who's Who in American Colleges and Universities. Her name was accidentally omitted in an earlier article.



# MORE WAR

## "Not for publication": how the U.S. plans to stay

by Tom Egelhardt/Pacific News Service  
(Egelhardt holds a graduate degree in Far Eastern Studies from Harvard University, is co-author of "To Change China," "The Indochina Story," and a contributor to "China and Ourselves." He is an editor of Pacific News Service)

Washington, D.C.—Despite Nixon's much-publicized troop withdrawals and his announced "generation of peace," the US government is becoming deeply involved in long-range planning for a pacified, pro-American South Vietnam. These plans call for massive US military and economic support a decade or more into the future.

At this moment, a group of professors at Columbia's School of International Affairs are under contract to the State Department to prepare a report detailing the feasibility of associating the UN and other international organizations with the future "economic rehabilitation of Vietnam." As the State Department's original proposal explained: "The importance of rehabilitation and development in Vietnam and US readiness to help, are taken for granted."

According to the project's director, Ruth Russell, the final report will be presented to the State Department by January 1, 1972.

Though budgeted with an estimated \$42,000 of taxpayers' money, like so many of these reports it is likely to be hard, if not impossible, for the public to see. As Russell herself admitted, the report will not be published "for a period of time."

Little is known of Russell's work, but Pacific News Service has uncovered two other reports on Vietnam's future. Each is of a semi-official nature and both, according to Washington insiders, are receiving serious attention by the long-range planners at the State Department and in other branches of the government. In late 1970, Emile Benoit, Professor of International Business at Columbia, consultant to the State Department, the Pentagon, and various private companies, did a study for the South Vietnamese government and the Asian Development Bank. (The ADB is funded mainly by the U.S. and Japan.) The other survey was done by Arthur Smithies, former director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget, admitted CIA contact, Harvard economics professor, and a member of Russell's present research team. It was sponsored by the Institute for Defense Analysis (financed by the Pentagon.)

Both of these reports are based on one significant assumption: the Indochina war, they suggest, will end in such a way that South Vietnam will not only be a separate country, but will be part of the capitalist market economy. How to make it both a more profitable part of that economy and less of a drain on U.S. resources are the twin aims of the reports.

Benoit, reached by Pacific News Service at his office in Uris Hall on the Columbia campus, was surprised to hear that (the service) had obtained a part of his longer study, an appendix entitled "How Vietnam Hostilities Could End." This section, he stated, was "not for publication." However, he added, when questioned, that it provides "the basis for the rest of the report."

In it, he puts aside the possibility of an NLF and North Vietnamese victory as not being "of concern" to the Asian Development Bank. As he sums it up: "In short, we are considering here the post-hostilities adjustment problems of the Republic of Vietnam, the nation now a member of the ADB, not of a unified Vietnam that would be created as a result of a victory for Hanoi."

Instead, he lays out this scenario: "Before the end of 1973," there will be "a type of informal North Vietnamese withdrawal, with a continued low level insurgency by the Viet Cong, providing South Vietnam with a respite of uncertain duration—that seems to be the most likely way in which hostilities will end." In other words, the war will die a natural death.

Since the Nixon administration has suggested just such a withering away process (and talked only vaguely of a "residual force" of troops), it is interesting to see how Benoit defines U.S. withdrawal and the process of Vietnamization. His "optimistic

projection" of U.S. troop withdrawal rates would leave "a volunteer training force" of 25,000 men there until December 31, 1975 (at which point his projections simply stop).

As for the withdrawal of U.S. troops from the Saigon regime, Benoit gave us these startling figures. As late as 1974, he said, his "realistic" estimate was that the U.S. would still be giving \$1.65 billion in combined military and economic aid per year. Of this figure, the direct military part (the war having died away) would still be \$12 billion.

The South Vietnamese economy, he pointed out, is "living on aid and war-making." Their army, moreover, "is a Frankenstein. It's way out of line with Vietnam's resources. Of course, that's natural; it's modeled on U.S. ideas and it's the most expensive and lavish of any army ever seen."

He told us that his report suggested a series of steps which must be taken to put the economy back on its feet: a buildup of other sources of aid such as the Asian Development Bank, the World Bank and individual countries like Japan; a rapid expansion of exports; a large increase in rubber production (which would mean the plating of endless thousands of new rubber trees to replace those burned and blasted out by the war); and a diversion of rice supplies from the "Vietcong" back into what he called "the economy of Vietnam."

In his vision, a reconstructed Republic of Vietnam would have a smaller army and an economy open to Western investment, tied by the export of raw materials into the Western market system.

When asked about the future of oil in South Vietnam, Benoit commented that he knew it "was on the horizon; but, he said "it's not my field and I don't know enough about it to comment on it." Smithies, however, is effusive on the subject. "The outlook for the future will be transformed," he says in his survey for the Institute for Defense Analysis, "if oil is discovered." He assumes, of course, that "the production and export of oil will have to depend on foreign enterprises."

Like Benoit, he concluded that "the future of Vietnam should lie in the world economy rather than in economic parochialism" (i.e., an NLF victory). And when he surveys the Vietnamese scene, he is not despairing. Despite the many obstacles he cites such as the serious drop in exports, the doubling of imports within ten years, corruption, insufficient capital savings, he sees hope. He points to the numerous technicians trained by the Americans, the miles of roads American engineers have laid, vast ports built—in fact, everything necessary for an "infra-structure" for future development along lines that appeal to him. As he puts it, "At fantastic cost, the war has fulfilled some of the necessary preconditions for development."

As for the underpinnings of this development, in his study (evidently not meant for publication) he suggests an interesting conception of withdrawal and Vietnamization. Like Benoit, he says that "the best planning assumption seems to be military stalemate and withering away of the war, a process that can last for a decade or more." While the war is withering away, he adds, U.S. aid to Saigon will have to be "around 500 million dollars a year" for the next ten years.

When we asked Benoit (who spent two weeks in Vietnam in 1970 researching his study) whether he felt it was realistic to assume either that the war would die a natural death or that a pro-Western Vietnam, open to U.S. investment, would continue to exist, he told us: "There's a real reservoir of strength and ability in the middle ranks and even among some at the top of that government. If they could ever get rid of some of those top figures, the country might have survival value." But when pressed for his personal opinion, all he would say was: "I don't know. I'm just not sure." How then, we asked, could he write a whole report on Vietnam's future based on an assumption he wasn't sure he agreed with? "But those were the assumptions of my employers," he replied. "That was who I was doing it for."





# feedback, cont.

To the Editor:

We feel that the Honor System should not be abolished, that it should continue to include both social and academic aspects of the college. Many students at the college are unaware of the advantages of living under the Honor System. It is difficult to state as a matter of fact that the honor code does cut down on stealing, but in comparing MWC to other schools without honor systems it appears that the other schools have a much higher rate of stealing and dishonesty. We know of one instance where the girls of a college must sit and watch their laundry while it is washing or it will be stolen, and another case in which food could no longer be kept in the kitchens because it too was stolen as soon as it was put in. Students in most colleges must keep their doors locked all the time, while not having to lock doors all the time at MWC is a privilege that is seldom thought about. We realize that MWC is not perfect, but we feel that the honor system drastically reduces stealing here in other colleges.

We sincerely hope that the students at Mary Washington will think twice before deciding to abolish the honor system.

Sincerely,  
Barb Tesnar and Debbie DiLalla

To the Editor:

In view of the recent controversy over the Honor System, I felt compelled to write.

Granted, the Honor System is a tradition at Mary Washington and tradition is fine in its place. But we can't let tradition dictate to us. People and times do change and the only way a system like ours can survive is for it to be relevant.

To be relevant requires change. To seek change and to question the existing system is hardly an indication of lack of support of the system in principle. On the contrary, I feel that to question and seek change is the first step to making the Honor System the truly meaningful "way of life" it should and can be. To question is to progress; not to question is to stagnate and merely exist. The only way to progress is to question things as they are and having the foresight to see things as they could be.

"Change with Continuity." Beth Conrad's campaign slogan says a lot. The continuity is the basic principle of the Honor System with which the greater majority of us agree with and respect. The change comes with the times. We can still have relevant change and keep the basic principle of the system in tact.

This seems to me what Beth Conrad is trying to make us see: that the basic principle is fine and good but the structure needs a change to make it more relevant to our way of living. Thank God for students who have sought change in the past. If not for them, where would we be today. No drinking, no visitation, no self-scheduled exams and on and on.

I admire and respect Beth Conrad. I admire her courage to see the need for change and to speak out. This shows a great deal of interest in the system and a desire to preserve it but in a better, more relevant form. Thank you Beth, for making us see the worth of the system and the worth of change.

Sincerely,  
Edie Cobb

## Community 'sleeping'

To the Editor:

It really amazes me that an academic community is able to ignore the events that have taken place in the past week concerning the future role of the United States in world affairs. I have not attended one class in which a professor or student even bothered to mention the United Nations vote or the defeat of the

foreign aid bill in the Senate. History is being made, and to my regret, Mary Washington is sleeping. What happened to the zeal of May 1970 that was fostered on this campus? Are not America's future role and attitudes towards the people of the world "burning issues?" At a time when we could possibly show our support or rejection of acts by our government, we sit quietly. Is this the essence of academia today?

Mary Ann Wegener

## Degree committee explains procedure

To the Editor:

The student members of the Special Degree Programs Committee would like to clarify the purpose and function of the committee. Our purpose stated in the handbook on page 74, is "to assure maximum flexibility... a special major program consisting of courses from two or more departments which define the area of concentration." The requirements? A proposed course schedule consisting of eight courses in the major program chosen by the student and her faculty advisor. These are the only requirements. The committee has no set guidelines. The committee does not even investigate the student's grade point average. That is how much we wish to encourage students.

Over the phone or in person, the committee members speak to each individual about her program because we are interested and wish to understand fully the student's purpose in her goal. Three degrees out of four have already been granted—an ecology major with a scientific approach, an English-linguistics program, and another ecology degree from a journalist's point of view. The committee is continually searching for new ideas in an area of concentration. Otherwise, why would we have been created? We encourage the student with a definite purpose.

It must also be understood by every student that so far we have rejected no one. The committee may feel some revisions are necessary and therefore ask the student to work on her program some more. However, if a student does not work on these revisions or a compromise, she in the end is rejecting the committee. We are not yes men, blindly

granting every student's wish. We are here to guide and encourage students to develop special programs in an area of concentration. We could not be more sincere in our efforts. "We aim to please" and if one student feels rejected, it is on her part—not ours.

Sincerely,  
The Student Members of the  
Special Degree Program Committee

## Class Council offers concert

To the Editor:

As an organization to provide social activities and coordinate class functions, Class Council has engaged The Spurlows to present their multi-media show in GW auditorium on Monday, November 22 at 8 p.m. This is not just a concert but a full show complete with nine singers, an entire band, and a fantastic array of lighting and sound techniques. The group has appeared on various T.V. programs, including a Bob Hope special, as well as before the President; it represented the Chrysler Corporation in commercials and high school promotions; it has released numerous albums; and now this group is presenting a brand new exciting show on college campuses across the nation.

Since the lack of popular entertainment on campus is evident, Class Council is attempting to correct the situation. We realize this is a relatively unknown group but, hopefully, this concert will only be the beginning for if it is well received and a financial success, plans will be formalized for a "name-group" concert in the spring. Heeding the cry for more concerts, we have initiated the process, now we need your support to make it a reality. Tickets are on sale for only \$1.50 November 12-19 from 11-1 and 6-8 p.m. in ACL foyer, or for \$2.00 at the door.

The future for bigger and better concerts on campus depends upon the success of this show.

Sincerely,  
Class Council



**YES, POPCORN**

POPCORN TOPS WITH LITTLE  
PUITS OF SHEERNESS RIB  
CLOSE WITH SMALL  
SHOULDERS TRIM LEAN  
LONG IN A SLEW OF  
COLORS \$15 SIZES S M L  
POLO BROWN GREEN  
PURPLE NAVY SCOOP PUL  
WHITE BLACK ORANGE LACE  
UP WHITE BLACK ROYAL OR  
RED HAVE SOME POPCORN

**LA VOGUE**

## LEE'S

Gifts—Music Instruments—Antiques

619 Caroline—373-2100

Capes from Mexico  
100% wool, reversible  
bright colors, hand made.

Hurry for best selection

## Classifieds

**HELP WANTED** at Captain's Quarters in basement of Latchstring. Must be 21.

**PERSIAN KITTENS** for sale: Black, one male, one female. CFA registered. \$25 without papers. \$40 with. Three weeks old. Box trained. Will hold for Christmas. Contact Trisha Ferrand, Ex. 413.

For sale sarees and handbags from India. Lady's fur coat size 10-12. Flute in good condition \$40. Siamese kittens. Contact Mr. Singh 373-0438.

**COLONIAL**  
101 Caroline Street • Phone 373-4861

**NOW PLAYING**  
Chorlton Heston  
"PLANET OF THE APES"  
Plus  
"BENEATH THE PLANET OF THE APES"  
Rated "G" In Color

**SATURDAY ONLY MIDNIGHT SHOW**  
"NOTORIOUS CLEOPATRA"  
"DA'SY CHAIN"  
Rated "X"

**IN FREDERICKSBURG IT'S THE**  
**VICTORIA Theatre**  
1012 CAROLINE STREET • 373-7321

**NOW PLAYING**  
Richard Roundtree  
"SHAFT"  
Music by Isaac Hayes  
Rated "R" In Color

**One HOUR**  
**"MARTINIZING"**  
CONTAINS  
THE MOST IN DRY CLEANING

### Specials

Tues. Wed. Thurs.

Suits—\$1.00

Dress—\$1.00

Skirt—.60

Slacks—.60

Hrs. 7:00 a.m.  
to 6:00 p.m.  
Mon. - Sat.

1230 Jefferson  
Davis Blvd.

Next to Pizza Hut  
Phone 373-4777

**STATIONERY**  
GREETING CARDS  
ARTISTS SUPPLIES  
BOOKS & BIBLES  
PICTURE FRAMING  
LEATHER GOODS  
PRINTING  
ENGRAVING  
PHOTO WORK  
OFFICE PRODUCTS  
GIFTS, GAMES & GADGETS  
School Supplies, Too!

**Kishpaugh's**  
**STATIONERY**

214 William St.  
DOWNTOWN  
Open every day  
8:30 until 5:30  
Friday 8:30 until 8:30

## ENCANTO SHOES



8.99



**BARETT SHOES**  
PARK & SHOP SHOPPING CENTER  
OPEN DAILY 10 A.M. to 9 P.M.

MASTER CHARGE  
CENTRAL CHARGE  
BANKAMERICARD

Pick a color  
that makes you  
happy... or  
matches o dress.  
We'll dye this white  
fabric shoe any  
color you choose.

FOR ALL TRAVEL RESERVATIONS

## AIR—RAIL—SHIP

STUDENT TOURS



**FREDERICKSBURG  
TRAVEL AGENCY**

105 WILLIAM ST.

373-6900



CENTRAL CHARGE  
BANK AMERICARD  
MASTER CHARGE

For The Women of Taste

**Haber**  
FREDERICKSBURG  
PARK & SHOP  
PHONE: 373-3226

Open Daily And Saturdays 10 A.M. to 9 P.M.



**merle norman**  
COSMETICS

COURTESY DEMONSTRATION BY APPOINTMENT  
STUDIO HOURS: 10:00-9:00 MON. THRU FRI.

HALLMARK CARDS & GIFTS

TELEPHONE: 373-2628

Fredericksburg Park & Shop Shpg. Center

Gifts—Jewelry;  
Candles  
Studio Cards

FREE GIFT  
WRAPPING

FREDERICKSBURG  
SHOPPING CENTER

**KiBet's**

TEL.  
373-4420

Do not wait out in the cold for a bus. If it is a weekend date or a trip home for the holidays it is cheaper for 5 or 6 people to go by cab. French will go to Blacksburg, Lexington, Charlottesville, Richmond, Washington, D.C., Annapolis, Princeton, New Jersey or New York.

Call 373-6915  
**FRENCH**

Your friendly driver is always happy to serve you.

**the pants...  
the prices...  
the Wearhouse.**

We're particular about the pants we sell! Only the biggest names, the finest fabrics—but at prices cut at least 40% lower than other stores. The pants on the right—big, big, label, woven of wool, silk and nylon. Other stores sell these pants for \$22, we sell them at **12.97**. Come in and scoop up more than 30 different styles for the holidays ahead.

**9<sup>97</sup>**



### Nationally Advertised Price

Famous label dresses, 22-44.00	12.97-24.97
Stacks, jeans, pants, 11-28.00	6.97-13.97
Skinny rib tops, 8-16.00	4.97 - 8.97
Blouses and shirts, 14-18.00	7.97 - 9.47
Sweaters and skirts, 12-22.00	5.47-11.97
Fashion pantsuits, 24-90.00	15.97-54.97
Ladies suits, 28-65.00	18.97-37.97
Hot pant sets, 26-34.00	13.97-19.97
Hot pants, 12-16.00	6.97 - 8.97

### Wearhouse Price

**the Wearhouse**

FREDERICKSBURG location is just off route 85 two miles on route 17N. Open Mon-Sat., 9-6. Telephone (703) 752-5211.

FREDERICK location is just off route 705 on route 88. Open daily from 10-8, Saturday 10-8. Telephone (301) 863-5500.

MOST MAJOR CREDIT CARDS HONORED